

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 ROBERT W. OLSON,

11 Plaintiff(s),

12 v.

13 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC.,

14 Defendant(s).
15

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00201-APG-NJK

Order

(Docket No. 8)

16 Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order
17 requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 8. The parties seek an extended discovery
18 period of 213 days measured from the date Defendant filed its answer on April 20, 2018. *Id.*; *see*
19 *also* Docket No. 6.

20 A discovery period longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period of 180 days
21 "must include...a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply...."
22 Local Rule 26-1(a). The parties ask for an extended discovery period "to ensure the parties have
23 sufficient time to both conduct its own investigations and engage in settlement discussions before
24 expending significant resources to conduct discovery and prepare dispositive motions." Docket
25 No. 8 at 1. This statement of the reason why a longer time period should apply is vague and,
26 therefore, insufficient under Local Rule 26-1(a) to warrant an extended discovery period that is
27 longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period of 180 days.
28

1 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' joint proposed discovery
2 plan. Docket No. 8. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than
3 June 5, 2018.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: May 30, 2018

6
7 
8 _____
9 NANCY J. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28